

NATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR HEALTH AND CARE EXCELLENCE

HEALTH TECHNOLOGY APPRAISAL PROGRAMME

Equality impact assessment – Guidance development

MTA Erythropoiesis-stimulating agents (epoetin and darbepoetin) for treating anaemia in people having cancer treatment (including review of TA142)

The impact on equality has been assessed during this appraisal according to the principles of the NICE equality scheme.

Consultation

1. Have the potential equality issues identified during the scoping process been addressed by the Committee, and, if so, how?

During scoping, some consultees raised the potential equality issue regarding people unable to receive blood transfusion for religious reasons (the Jehovah's Witness group).

The Committee recommended erythropoiesis-stimulating agents (ESAs) within their marketing authorisations for treating anaemia associated with cancer treatment. People unable to receive blood transfusion would be able to receive ESAs in line with their marketing authorisations. Therefore, this potential equality issue is not relevant to the Committee's preliminary recommendations.

2. Have any other potential equality issues been raised in the submissions, expert statements or academic report, and, if so, how has the Committee addressed these?

No other potential equality issues were raised.

3. Have any other potential equality issues been identified by the

Committee, and, if so, how has the Committee addressed these?
No other potential equality issues were identified.

4. Do the preliminary recommendations make it more difficult in practice for a specific group to access the technology compared with other groups? If so, what are the barriers to, or difficulties with, access for the specific group?
No

5. Is there potential for the preliminary recommendations to have an adverse impact on people with disabilities because of something that is a consequence of the disability?
No

6. Are there any recommendations or explanations that the Committee could make to remove or alleviate barriers to, or difficulties with, access identified in questions 4 or 5, or otherwise fulfil NICE's obligations to promote equality?
Not applicable

7. Have the Committee's considerations of equality issues been described in the appraisal consultation document, and, if so, where?
Not applicable

Approved by Associate Director (name): Elisabeth George.....

Date: 07/04/14

Final appraisal determination

(when an ACD issued)

1. Have any additional potential equality issues been raised during the consultation, and, if so, how has the Committee addressed these?

No potential equality issues were raised.

2. If the recommendations have changed after consultation, are there any recommendations that make it more difficult in practice for a specific group to access the technology compared with other groups? If so, what are the barriers to, or difficulties with, access for the specific group?

Not applicable (the recommendations have not changed after consultation).

3. If the recommendations have changed after consultation, is there potential for the recommendations to have an adverse impact on people with disabilities because of something that is a consequence of the disability?

Not applicable (the recommendations have not changed after consultation).

4. If the recommendations have changed after consultation, are there any recommendations or explanations that the Committee could make to remove or alleviate barriers to, or difficulties with, access identified in questions 2 and 3, or otherwise fulfil NICE's obligations to promote equality?

Not applicable (the recommendations have not changed after consultation).

5. Have the Committee's considerations of equality issues been described in the final appraisal determination, and, if so, where?

No equality issues relevant to the Committee's recommendations were raised.

Approved by Centre or Programme Director (name): Meindert Boysen

Date: 15/10/2014